

From: [Oleson, Mary E - DNR](#)
To: [Kraj, Susan](#)
Subject: RE: Draft Title V permit for Carmeuse Stone and Lime - Rockwell Operation
Date: Friday, October 8, 2021 12:58:25 PM

Thanks Susan. Hanna is on family leave until November. Ben Garbe is helping to process this permit while she is out. I forwarded your comments to him and we will work on a response.

Mary

We are committed to service excellence.

Visit our survey at <http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey> to evaluate how I did.

Mary E. Oleson, P.E.

Phone: (608) 789-5544

mary.oleson@wisconsin.gov

From: Kraj, Susan <kraj.susan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2021 1:41 PM
To: Moscho, Hanna R - DNR <hanna.moscho@wisconsin.gov>
Cc: Oleson, Mary E - DNR <Mary.Oleson@wisconsin.gov>
Subject: Draft Title V permit for Carmeuse Stone and Lime - Rockwell Operation

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization.
Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Hi Hanna -

I have reviewed the draft Title V permit renewal (469033730-P20) for Carmeuse Stone and Lime – Rockwell Operation, and I have the following comments on the permit record (PD) and the draft permit:

1. There are several footnotes in the PD (pp. 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, etc.,) which state: “Pursuant to WDNR’s “Guidance for Including PM2.5 in Air Pollution Control Permit Application” dated February 22, 2016, PM2.5 emissions from low temperature processes do not produce PM2.5 emissions.” It was EPA R5’s understanding that such statements were no longer going to be included in the PD or permit, and would be replaced with the following general statement instead (which is included in this PD): “As required by 40 CFR s. 70.5(c)(3)i, emission estimates sufficient to verify which requirements are applicable to the source are included in this analysis. Bases on the definition in ss. NR 400.02(123m) and (124), Wis. Adm. Code, direct PM2.5 emissions cannot exceed PM10 emissions. Since PM10 and PM2.5 have the

same major source thresholds, emission estimates of PM10 are sufficient for determining Part 70 and PSD source status with respect to both PM2.5 and PM10.”

2. In the draft permit (on p. 10), for the SO2 conditions for P36, permit condition I.A.2.b.(3) states, “To demonstrate compliance with I.A.1.a.(3)....” However, I.A.1.a.(3) is a PM limit. Should the citation be to I.A.2.a.(3) instead? Same question for the SO2 conditions for P33 on p. 19 of the draft permit.
3. In the draft permit (on p.11), condition I.A.3.b.(1) provides that “The instrumentation shall be available and in use a minimum of 85% of the time Process P36 is operated.” Is there a condition in I.A.3.c. or elsewhere in the permit to ensure and track that the instrumentation is being used at least 85% of the time?
4. For condition I.E.1.b.(1) in the draft permit, should there be a requirement to operate the filters (for S24, S30 and S65, and the baghouse for S10) at all times the units are operating in order to assure compliance with the permit limits? (These permit limits are the PTEs that were calculated in the PD based on the control devices operating at a specific control efficiency.)

Thank you for considering these comments. Please feel free to contact me at any time.

Susan Kraj
Air Permit Section
US EPA Region 5
(312)353-2654